



FILED

5-19-16
04:59 PM

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

In the Matter of the Application of Pacific Gas
and Electric Company for Approval of its
Electric Vehicle Infrastructure and Education
Program.

(U39E)

Application 15-02-009
(Filed February 9, 2015)

**JOINT PARTIES
NOTICE OF *EX PARTE* COMMUNICATION**

Pursuant to Rule 8.4 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) hereby gives notice of the following joint parties' *ex parte* communication. The communication occurred on Monday, May 16, 2016, at 1:30 PM at the offices of California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC). The communication was oral, and included a handout, which is attached. [Rule 8.4(a)]

Sidney Dietz, Director, Regulatory Relations, PG&E, initiated the communication with Jennifer Kalafut, Energy Advisor to Commissioner Carla Peterman. Also present were: David Gamson, Chief of Staff to Commissioner Peterman; Jana Corey, Director, Electrification and Alternative Fuels, PG&E; Joel Espino, Legal Counsel, The Greenlining Institute; Steven Douglas, Senior Director, Alliance of Automobile Manufacturers; Thomas Ashley, Senior Director, Greenlots; and Max Baumhefner, NRDC. [Rule 8.4(b)]

Ms. Corey described the settlement, and highlighted the settlement's similarity to the SDG&E decision, the inclusion of DC fast charging, the large amount of deployment in disadvantaged communities in the settlement, and the array of settling parties. Ms. Corey stated that the costs in the settlement were based on a recent PG&E RFI. Ms. Corey further

stated that the settlement follows the model of a turnkey system of site hosts, but is flexible enough to allow for either the site host or the EVSP to be the customer of record. Mr. Baumhefner stated that the issue of the frequency of equipment-procurement RFOs is a minor one. Mr. Douglas stated that, for the auto manufacturers, DC fast charging is critical to the future of the market, and noted that in California there are insufficient chargers with one per eighteen charging stations compared to one to four or one to eight cited as the requirement by the NREL study. Mr. Ashley stated that DC fast charging is critical for increasing electric vehicle adoption and an essential component of the settlement, and that the settlement model can accommodate differences in what party is listed as the customer of record. [Rule 8.4(c)]

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Erik B. Jacobson

Erik B. Jacobson
Director, Regulatory Relations
Pacific Gas and Electric Company
P.O. Box 770000, Mail
San Francisco, CA 94177
Phone: 415-973-4464
Fax: 415-973-7226
E-mail: EBJ1@pge.com

Dated: May 19, 2016



March 21st, 2016

PG&E Files Settlement Agreement with Broad Support for Improved EV Charging Program

On Monday March 21, PG&E filed a settlement agreement in its Electric Vehicle (EV) infrastructure proceeding at the CPUC. The agreement makes substantial improvements to the utility's proposal to highlight the load-management and fuel savings-benefits the program should enable. PG&E and the settling parties believe that, if approved, the Charge Smart and Save program will significantly increase access to EV charging and encourage greater EV adoption in support of the Governor's Zero-Emission Vehicle goals.

The settling parties represent a broad coalition from diverse areas and interests.

- Alliance of Automobile Manufacturers
- Center for Sustainable Energy
- Coalition of California Utility Employees
- General Motors
- The Greenlining Institute
- Greenlots
- Honda
- Natural Resources Defense Council
- Marin Clean Energy
- PG&E
- Plug In America
- Sierra Club
- Sonoma Clean Power Authority

Under the settlement agreement, PG&E would deploy and own 7,500 Level 2 chargers and 100 DC fast chargers throughout its service territory. The utility will partner with EV Service Providers to operate and maintain chargers and networks. The program would run three years, with a budget cap of \$160 million.

The settlement terms reflect the CPUC's approval of EV infrastructure programs from Southern California Edison and San Diego Gas and Electric. PG&E looked specifically toward the CPUC's decision in SDG&E's proposal, and adopted equivalent criteria to offer greater site host choice and spur innovation in EV charging services. These criteria include:

- Site host choice of pre-qualified equipment and services to encourage innovation and competition among EV service providers
- Site host control over pricing options to drivers, including passing time-of-use prices directly to drivers to encourage charging when there is lower demand on the electric grid
- A modest participation payment from site-hosts to encourage private investment
- A peak bill impact of approximately \$0.22 monthly (\$2.64 annually) for the typical residential customer, less than the approved increase in the SDG&E case.

PG&E also increases its commitment to deploy 15% of charger sites in Disadvantaged Communities, with a stretch goal of 20% – and sets aside \$5 million for vehicle equity programs in those areas.

The program will also target 50% of charger sites in multi-unit dwellings, a key segment that requires greater access to EV charging to enable broader adoption of electric vehicles.



IOU EV Program Comparison



Approved Decision



Settlement Agreement



Approved Decision

Scope

Up to 3,500 L1 & L2 at 350 sites
(60% of original 5,500)

3 years

7,500 L2 (30% of original)
100 DCFC (100% of original)

3 years

At least 1,250 L1 & L2
(4% of total in Phase 1)

At least 12 months

Budget

\$45M
(40% of original \$103M)

\$160M
(24% of original \$654M)

\$22M
(6% of total \$355M)

Charger Ownership, O&M

SDG&E owned

PG&E owned

Site host owned

Equipment & Services Choice

Site host choice of pre-qualified service providers

Site host choice of pre-qualified service providers

Site host purchase of pre-qualified service providers

Participation Fee

10% of average EVSE cost for MUDs, 20% for workplaces

Fee waived for Disadv. Communities, government, school, non-profit, small business and affordable housing sites

10% of EVSE cost for MUDs, 20% for private businesses;

Fee waived for Disadv. Communities, gov't, and non-profit sites

Site host buys equipment

25-50% rebate from SCE

100% rebate for Disadv. Communities

Rates/Pricing

Choice of VGI rate to driver or to site host

Choice of commercial TOU rate (e.g. A6) to driver or to site host

Site host pays commercial rate, sets pricing



IOU EV Program Comparison



Approved Decision

Settlement Agreement

Approved Decision

Target Markets

Target 50% MUD / 50% Workplace

Workplace, MUD (target 50%),
public/retail

Workplace, MUD, Public/Retail
(no specific allocation)

Phasing

Semi-annual progress reports

Phase 2 would be filed separately

Quarterly progress reports for Phase 1,

Separate hearings for Phase 2, with one
year "Bridge" funding until decision

After 12-24 months, SCE to serve pilot
report and Phase 2 application

Load Management

VGI rate reflects grid conditions; if site
host takes rate, must submit load
management tactics

TOU rate reflects grid conditions; if site
host takes rate, must submit load
management tactics

Evaluate load management strategies in
Pilot Phase

Develop DR program within 3 years

Disadvantaged Communities

10% commitment; CARE customers
excused from rate-base of program

15% commitment with 20% stretch goal;
\$5M for vehicle equity programs

10% commitment; 100% rebate for
charger costs in DACs

Site Host Recruitment

SDG&E + 3rd party partners

PG&E + 3rd party partners

SCE + 3rd party partners

Advisory Committee

Yes

Yes

Yes